#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

#### **PCT**

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference SCB 1563 EUR	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below	
International application No. PCT/IB2004/001408	International filing date (day/month/year) 08 April 2004 (08.04.2004)	Priority date (day/month/year) 11 April 2003 (11.04.2003) ]	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC <sup>7</sup> A61K 31/16, A61P 25/16			
Applicant NEWRON PHARMACEUTICALS, S.P.A.			

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).			
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.			
	In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.			
3.	This report contains indications relating to the following items:			
	Box No. I	Basis of the report		
	Box No. II	Priority		
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability		
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention		
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited		
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application		
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application		
4.		mmunicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but nakes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority		

	Date of issuance of this report 14 October 2005 (14.10.2005)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer  Idhir Britel
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60

Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)

#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

	HING AUTHORITY	RECEIVED	DOT
o:		1 8 OCT 2004	PCT
		WIPO PCT	
	L	WRITT	EN OPINION OF THE
see form PC	CT/ISA/220	INTERNATION	IAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
		(F	PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)
		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
Applicant's or agent's file re		FOR FURTHER A See paragraph 2 belo	
see form PCT/ISA/220			Priority date (day/month/year)
nternational application No	o. International filing date 08.04.2004	(day/month/year)	11.04.2003
PCT/IB2004/001408			
	fication (IPC) or both national classification	on and IPC	
A61K31/16, A61P25/1	.0		
Applicant	DELITICAL C. INC		
NEWRON PHARMAC	JEUTICALS, INC.		
<ol> <li>This opinion con</li> </ol>	ntains indications relating to the fo	ollowing items:	
⊠ Box No. I	Basis of the opinion		
⊠ Box No. II	Priority		
⊠ Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with re	egard to novelty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicability
□ Roy No. IV	Lack of unity of invention		
□ Roy No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to	novelty, inventive step or industrial
□ Roy No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to	novelty, inventive step or industrial
☐ Box No. IV ☑ Box No. V ☐ Box No. VI	Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited	ibis.1(a)(i) with regard to ons supporting such sta	novelty, inventive step or industrial
☐ Box No. IV ☑ Box No. V ☐ Box No. VI ☐ Box No. VII	Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to ons supporting such sta	novelty, inventive step or industrial
☐ Box No. IV ☑ Box No. V ☐ Box No. VI ☐ Box No. VII	Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international a Certain observations on the international	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to ons supporting such sta	novelty, inventive step or industrial
☐ Box No. IV ☐ Box No. V ☐ Box No. VI ☐ Box No. VII ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box No. VIII	Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43. applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international accertain observations on the international on International preliminary examination of the International Preliminary Examinates an Authority other than this one eau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that writte	sbis.1(a)(i) with regard to one supporting such state application tional application is made, this opinion wining Authority ("IPEA").	o novelty, inventive step or industrial tement  ill usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where e chosen IPEA has notifed the
☐ Box No. IV ☐ Box No. V ☐ Box No. VI ☐ Box No. VII ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box No. III ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box No. III ☐ Box No. IV ☐ Box No. VI ☐ Box No. VIII ☐ Box N	Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international at Certain observations on the international of the International Preliminary Examination of the International Preliminary Examinations and Authority other than this one eau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that writtensidered.  as provided above, considered to be A a written reply together, where applications and attended of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220	abis.1(a)(i) with regard to one supporting such state application tional application is made, this opinion wining Authority ("IPEA"). The to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Interrese a written opinion of the propriets with amendments.	ill usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where e chosen IPEA has notifed the eational Searching Authority
Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII Box No. VIII  FURTHER ACTION If a demand for in written opinion of the applicant chol International Burdwill not be so corlif this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expired	Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international at Certain observations on the international of the International Preliminary Examination of the International Preliminary Examinations and Authority other than this one eau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that writtensidered.  as provided above, considered to be A a written reply together, where applications and attended of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220	abis.1(a)(i) with regard to one supporting such state application tional application is made, this opinion wining Authority ("IPEA"). The to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Interrese a written opinion of the propriets with amendments.	ill usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where e chosen IPEA has notifed the sational Searching Authority  e IPEA, the applicant is invited to
Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII Box No. VIII Compared to the applicant choral burd will not be so correctly from the whichever expired for further option.	Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international at Certain observations on the international of the International Preliminary Examination of the International	abis.1(a)(i) with regard to one supporting such state application tional application is made, this opinion wining Authority ("IPEA"). The to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Interrese a written opinion of the propriets with amendments.	ill usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where e chosen IPEA has notifed the sational Searching Authority  e IPEA, the applicant is invited to
Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII Box No. VIII Compared to the applicant choral burd will not be so correctly from the whichever expired for further option.	Reasoned statement under Rule 43 applicability; citations and explanation Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international a Certain observations on the international of the International Preliminary examination of the International Preliminary Examinates an Authority other than this one eau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written sidered.  as provided above, considered to be A a written reply together, where applications are presented as provided above.	abis.1(a)(i) with regard to one supporting such state application tional application is made, this opinion wining Authority ("IPEA"). The to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Interrese a written opinion of the propriets with amendments.	ill usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where e chosen IPEA has notifed the sational Searching Authority  e IPEA, the applicant is invited to



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Cattell, James

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8468



### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/001408

_	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion
1.	With re	egard to the <b>language</b> , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in iguage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	la	nis opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search inder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With r	egard to any <b>nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence</b> disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. type	e of material:
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. for	nat of material:
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c. tim	e of filing/furnishing:
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3	ł	n addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4	. Addit	ional comments:

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/001408

	Box	No. II	Priority
<del>1</del> .	<u> ⊠</u>		lowing document has not been furnished:
		$\boxtimes$	copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
			translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).
		Conse	quently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has neless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
2		hae he	binion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim en found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international ate indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3	. Add	ditional d	observations, if necessary:

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/001408

	No. III Non-establishment of licability	opir	nion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial
The obv	questions whether the claimed i jous), or to be industrially applica	nven able h	tion appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non avec not been examined in respect of:
	☐ the entire international application,		
$\boxtimes$	claims Nos. 1-45		
because:			
Ø	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. see separate sheet relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):		
see separate sheet			
	l the description, claims or drawings <i>(indicate particular elements below)</i> or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed <i>(specify)</i> :		
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.		
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.		
	Visiting does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex		
	the written form		has not been furnished
			does not comply with the standard
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished
			does not comply with the standard
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, d not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.		
П	See separate sheet for further	· deta	ils

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

4-6,8,9,10,12-18,25-29,32-37,39-42,53-56

No: C

Claims 1,

2,3,7, 11,19, 20,21,

 $\overline{22,23,24,25,30,31,38,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52},$ 

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-56

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

46-56

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

#### International application No.

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/IB2004/001408

III.

1). Claims 1-45 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

V.

- 2). The documents cited in the search report are to be regarded as being numbered D1-D4 in their order of citation. The Examining division intend to refer to the sections of these documents highlighted in the search report, unless otherwise specified.
- 3). D1 seems to be a press release made available to the public in 09.01.03 (before the priority date). D1 discloses the successful combination of safinamide (0.5 and 1mg/kg) and dopamine agonists in Parkinson patients. This falls within the scope of claims 1,2,3,7,12,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,30,31,38,43-52 under Article 33(2) PCT.
- 4). Once knowing from D1 that such a combination could be successful, the alternatives expressed in the remaining claims would appear to be obvious to the skilled man. The description does not seem to detail how these alternatives have lead to technical effects which could not have been predicted from D1. These claims therefore do not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.